

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action dated February 11, 2008. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to some language used in the Abstract and rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 as indefinite. In response, Applicant has amended the Abstract to delete the language objected to by the Examiner. Applicant has also amended claims 1-17 to correct the antecedent basis problems and to amend the vague language noted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to the Abstract and the § 112 rejection of the claims have been overcome through these amendments. Applicant believes that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action includes a notation that there are no drawings present in the application that appears to be in error. This application was a national phase of a PCT application (PCT/EP04/053520), which was published with drawings comprising Figs. 1-6. Additionally, the present U.S. application also included Figs. 1-6 when it published (US 2007/0056131). Thus, the application as filed clearly had drawings.

Applicant respectfully submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Gregory C. Bays, Reg. No. 40,505
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6731
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 11, 2008